M1009
Wednesday July 6, 1966
Berkeley
Open meeting

Mr. Nyland: Is it running?

This is the third time that I am here in Berkeley at a what you might call a so-called 'open' meeting. I think we got a little experience in the first two. I don't think it was entirely right, if anyone of you were either at the first and second open sessions at that time; because I talked all the time; and you might say it was an attempt to try to condense in a very short hour all the different things that the Gurdjieff system entails and is connected with, and of course it was much too much. So, let's try it a little differently. Because I believe that there are some of you who know something about Gurdjieff or the ideas or have read something or heard a little about it; and perhaps you have some questions about that, and from there on we can start elucidating and building it up.

If there are any questions, then let's begin.

Questioner: Why is the emphasis on the individual rather than on society.

Mr. Nyland: You mean as far as Work is concerned?

Questioner: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: You think that a group can work together in an Objective sense? You see, you must understand: Work has to do with Objectivity, a group when it works together remains subjective. So, it defeats its purpose. It's not a cooperation. It is something of course that one wants to accomplish together, but it has to be on a certain basis starting out with the principle, which is to become Objective regarding oneself; and then afterwards it might be included—an Objectivity regarding other people—but if I start out by working with other people of course I will remain a subjective kind of a creature.

You see can answer this ... the question yourself if you know what is meant by Work. The difference between Gurdjieff and ... or the system as expounded by Gurdjieff and many religions

or philosophies or indications of how to behave ... any kind of form of behavior, it always has to do with Gurdjieff definitely said what you ought to do; whereas with many religions it is left to your own interpretation—or if you don't know what to do, that you can pray. So the emphasis on any kind of theory that may be involved and may be expressed by Gurdjieff, always has to be translated or converted into something of a practical value as an application of such ideas in one's life.

Now, if I start to do that with other people together, of course I am completely identified with someone else. Because that's the way I work about my life; and of course I use anything of my own personality, which personality of course is subjectivity *par excellence*: That either physically or emotionally or intellectually it still remains a subjective matter, so I will never learn what it is to be Objective—*if* one can agree that it is desirable first to become Objective. And of course I can talk about that for some time, but if one finally decides that Objectivity is the road away ... or the road to freedom, then of course I have to create conditions in which I can be as Objective as I possibly can, and I surely make it much harder for me to Work with other people when I'm all the time involved with them.

It depends entirely upon the aim, of course, that one has. At first it's necessary to establish that that is the kind of an aim a Man should pursue. It may not at all be the aim of everybody; but it all depends, then, on one's particular experience of how one has tried to do it in ordinary life, and if the aims are either freedom or more control or whatever way you want to describe a certain form of consciousness. You see, if one agrees on that, then I have to find out how to reach it, and I will never reach it subjectively.

What other questions. Have you read anything? Who has read something. What is your opinion about it. What...

New Questioner: I'm interested in the way that Ouspensky, in the Fourth Way, uses 'to do.' He says that we must realize that we can do nothing first, and I'm not sure what this means. I'm not sure what 'to do' for me means, because I feel like I do something.

Of course you do. So he cannot mean that, really—huh?

Questioner: No.

Mr. Nyland: Of course I'm afraid Ouspensky also 'did' in a certain way—whatever it was. There are two different things. One is, as a human being on Earth one is doing constantly certain things. Any human being made up of so-called three 'centers,' naturally has his body to

manifest; and the reason why he manifests is because he has a feeling or because he has a thought. So the 'doing' as we now know it for ordinary people who are also from the standpoint of Ouspensky unconscious, is simply that they behave in this world and make a living or do anything that they like, so of course they 'do.'

Now, the question of 'doing' that Ouspensky means is a certain kind of doing expressed by Gurdjieff as Work on oneself, and this particular work of course is a certain idea of doing something. So when he says 'doing' it means that the idea of trying to become Conscious which is involved in how one wants to Work on oneself, it's a form of doing when I apply it in a very definite way according to certain rules and *that* is the doing.

Now, to explain it a little more: That what has to be done is to attempt to Observe oneself. The three points as far as Work on oneself is concerned, is that I Observe myself as I am, that I accept myself as it is without criticism, and that I receive impressions of myself at the moment when it happens. These three ideas are Observation, and non-identification, and Simultaneity.

Have you any idea of that? Since you have read the Fourth Way of Ouspensky, do you know what is meant by it?

Questioner: I have an idea from it, and another question comes to mind; and that is that, um, that so many things functions which we perform which seem to happen so much more rapidly than our minds can interpret. What do we have to do to our minds to get them to be in touch with, um, our instincts?

Mr. Nyland: No, it has nothing to do with that. The idea of Work is that I try to build something that I haven't got at the present time. That Man the way he is as a personality with his mind functioning, with his feeling the way it is and with his body the way it is, is at the present time, from the standpoint of Gurdjieff an unconscious creature and that he is incapable at the present time to be Objective regarding himself. That's a statement you have to verify. Because either my thoughts or my feelings or anything that I do remains for me a subjective manifestation; if I want to introduce Objectivity, it simply means that something in my brain has to start to function as a new kind of faculty, only interested in being Objective. That would mean that it receives an impression of myself the way I am and the way I behave without having any like or dislike, without any description; without wanting to change it in some way or another and, as I say, it has to be done with Simultaneity—that is, it has to be registered at the moment when it actually happens.

Now, if you know a little bit about how your ordinary brain functions, it is a thought form or a certain mental process which is dependent on your memory or anticipation. One never lives in ordinary life in the moment, one always lives by memory or hopes for the future. The present is never there because it is too fleeting, and as soon as the moment is there it's gone ... and even if I say I am here at the 'present,' it's already past. So the mind is incapable of having anything receive; or rather, when it starts to function as a faculty which is capable of receiving impressions and such impressions being at the moment when they happen, that then when the next moment is that *again* that impression of the next moment is recorded in the same way. You see; so that I exclude, now, in the processes of the mind something that takes place at the present time all the time which is a thought form or associative form or anything that has to do with a description or that what I call 'anticipation' of the future events or that which has been 'stored away' in my mind as memory. This is the difficulty. The difficulty is really to have a recording of something that is momentary, recorded. This is the difficulty of living in the present. It can be acquired but it needs, of course, practice.

The other that has to be fulfilled as a requirement, is the Observation has to be without any like or dislike. The reason for that is, that if I Observe and I have an image of myself manifesting in a certain way—and that applies to the manifestations of the body only—that then I like or dislike, or at least I have a thought about what I have been doing. I criticize it, I feel about it; and all the time when I now try to see myself in that sense—that is, try to become Aware of myself—I am interfered with my feeling entering into the function of my intellect.

You see, the whole idea that is underlying this is: That Man the way he is, is not functioning correctly because his centers are not separated from each other; and that a Man never could become harmonious unless he first could separate the centers in a definite function of themselves, and then afterwards could be combined in such a way that they could make a harmonious entity. But as it is at the present time, I cannot separate my physical manifestation from a feeling. If I have a feeling, the only way that I really know it is the way I am physically. I have a little bit of an idea of a solar plexus existing and I say "Yes, it catches my breath" and so forth—and there is something moving—but immediately it is expressed in a state of my body. As far as the mind is concerned, it's a little easier because I can have thoughts in my mind that are not immediately in an activity; but usually I would say it is quite useless to have that; because my mind has to function in connection with what I am so-called 'doing' physically, and my brain

is, then, simply a guide for whatever I do in a physical state.

Now, if I want to think clearly—that is, if I want to have only an intellectual process taking place and really think about a certain subject or a particular kind of problem—even then my mind is interfered with by all kind of other thoughts. And, you know, the concentration that one might have that I have a mathematical problem I want to solve: I sit in front of my desk and a piece of paper and a pencil; and I sit and try to concentrate on just how much A plus B is, as soon as I start doing that ... and the least little thing around me that happens, or some kind of a noise, or for some reason I happen to think of my grandmother.

I can't explain it; but these are the haphazard ways of how my mind functions, and to be able to concentrate on any one particular problem at the exclusion of any other kind of a thought is impossible. Ouspensky—as you have read it, you will probably remember—mentions the question of how can one concentrate on the movement of the hands on a watch for not any longer than just half a minute, and then you're distracted. And, we know it in ordinary life: I try to do something quite intensely and intentionally and I want to exclude everything, and at the same time I think ten thousand things. I buy something, in the meantime my eyes sees this-and-that and I am ... of course I'm a little distracted. Not that it bothers me because I can still buy a loaf of bread, but if it is something that's a little more serious ... and particularly when I tell myself not to think of it and I start thinking it.

Questioner: That's my problem.

Mr. Nyland: Yea. You see, it is a very interesting phenomenon. Because you say we have a mind and the mind can think, I doubt very much if it can think—really think.

Questioner: Uh-huh.

Mr. Nyland: It can associate and it has all kinds of impressions already received before which of course are stored away; but I say "Mary," immediately there is an image of someone I know that has the name of Mary, and when someone says there is another Mary I start comparing it but it is not like that Mary. And these are the things that all the time will happen in ordinary life: I cut a slice of bread; of course I don't want to cut my fingers, at the same time I notice all kinds of other things and I am not there at all when I cut the bread. I happen to think about driving a car or something that happened or so-and-so told me this-and-that and whatever it may be, my thoughts are all the time associating and there are so many that very seldom that I have only one particular thought. And it may be true of a day, it may be true for a year ... because in a year

how many times do I think one way or another about certain things that I ought to do and I don't know how to go about it. I have knowledge of it, I study it and I am diverted to something else and I go ... try to pick up a room, clean it, if you are really good of course you will never get to the kitchen.

You know it.

Questioner: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: And, it is a simple thing and there is ... there is nothing wrong with it. As far as ordinary life is concerned we adjust to that, and that's the way we are. And sometimes when it gets a little bit too bad then we say it is like a chicken without a head; and for that you make an allowance when it is a chicken, but if I see it of myself: How absolutely without control and how when I behave and then in one way or another how the least little thing affects me and that I start to react to it, so that I don't have even any control about my own actions. Someone says "You are a fool" and I say "No, you are nothing," I am immediately involved in it. Because I want to prove I'm not a fool—the other is saying it, what does he know, of course he doesn't know anything at all—but the very fact that it is being said produces in me a reaction which is so automatic. Someone steps on my toes and I say "Goddamn it get off my toe," I can't help it, this is the way I have been brought up. And this simply is an illustration of many, many illustrations of an unconscious state, and that cannot be helped because that is the way human beings are and you might say that it's unfortunate.

So, you see, the whole point is that a personality, as he is as ordinary Man, is not at all capable of doing certain things a little extraordinary, or even to introduce something that has to do with a non-subjective element. In order to do it I have to find first a certain place in my brain that is capable of doing it; and as it is now, many parts of the brain have certain sections of course which are interested in certain work and it is their duty to perform that kind of a mental task—I have a formulatory apparatus in front and I have a pondering capacity, I have an associative capacity and I have something that is visual impressions and audible impressions and touch impressions I receive and translate—so the totality of the brain is pretty well occupied. And they go from one place to the other, how do thoughts all of a sudden start. Out of the blue sky? I happen to see something blue and I am reminded of ... of a little scripture—how come. And, I cannot control it. Because if I say "Don't," it is there. You see, whenever I tell myself not to, it will always be there.

Now, this is as far as my brain is concerned. Now the difficulty with let's say "I feel" something and my brain says not to feel it, and who wins. That what I feel—maybe, because my body wishes it. My brain says it's no good—"Don't eat candy, not good for your stomach"—but the next moment without even thinking about it I have a piece of candy in my mouth. And I ... really I ... it is sometimes funny and sometimes it's very sad.

Because, if that is what a Man is, you see, it is really very useless. As far as the world is concerned—living on Earth and working together with other people and doing this or that professionally, a person in whatever relationships—he makes adjustments, that he allows. It's something in his life that's all right—it works—and after a little while it will wear off and I become mature, after some time I have enough knowledge and then I know I shouldn't burn my finger and getting too close to the stove. And all these kind of things—education and we learn a great deal about this-and-that—and this is learning, but as far as activity is concerned I tell myself not to be embarrassed and here I enter a room and there are a lot of people I don't know and I became a wallflower, again I tell myself not to do it—"Oh, don't blush, don't be this-and-that"—and of course I blush more. I try to find words, the proper words, particularly when I'm emotionally involved, and I become stuck. Whatever ... I don't know exactly what kind of words and when I do use them I don't use the right tonation, and sometimes I want to look at a person and I don't dare because the other person has an opinion of me which I don't like.

That prejudice, I don't always see it. And all of this because we ... and it *is* my life and it, definitely it is Man. This is really the problem: Is Man the way he is at the present time, is he really a Man or is he just a little bit of a glorified animal. And as far as the physical body is concerned, it is much worse. Because the physical body simply wants certain things at a certain time regardless of your mind or your feeling; and it is that it's there and it has to be ... because it is hungry it has to be fed, it is sleepy therefore it must rest. And my mind and my feelings also say "Yes, that is right"—eight hours sleep, eight hours work, eight hours play— "that is the right way to look at it." When I want friends "Good, I want friends who agree with me and who don't argue," if they argue with me they become enemies and I don't see them anymore. And as I live my life of course it becomes smaller and smaller because I exclude those that hurt. I don't want to be told by others that I am so-and-so and this-and-that. I avoid it ... and, I limit myself. And all the different things that happen in a person's life regarding *his* body wanting this; all the selfishness is that what is predominating, excuses. I walk and all of a sudden ... because I have

an aim and I want to make money, I want to have a name, and you say I want this and that kind of a thing, and glorification—all of that, everything that is sometimes right and sometimes religious, sometimes maybe ideas that I can help the rest of the world and sometimes I don't.

You know, have you ever read anything of Gurdjieff?

Questioner: No.

Mr. Nyland: Then, by all means read. Because Ouspensky was only a pupil, sometimes very nice and sometimes bad. And particularly in The Fourth Way it is rather bad, it was a collection of stuff that was published after his death.

Questioner: I see.

Mr. Nyland: The one noteworthy: Perhaps he is responsible for that more or less, is In Search Of The Miraculous; and that has many things in it that are quite right, and some things... But, after all, it is nothing else but a description of what happened to him when he was in St. Petersburg and Moscow; that was many years ago, so it really has very little value than only that Ouspensky is someone like ... Gurdjieff, that happened to hear him at one place, that was Ouspensky.

But, you see, one doesn't get from it what is really meant by either a verification or an application, or an understanding of what it is to Work on oneself; and the only good that you will ever get out of Gurdjieff and his ideas is when you start to apply them. As long as it remains a nice little discussion or something that you can use at a tea party or affairs that are sometimes like that—and then I say "Oh, yes; this is Gurdjieff, I don't know..."—it is absolutely no good, it is a waste of time to do anything like that.

Questioner: Uh-huh.

Mr. Nyland: However, there is in one ... if one wants to get somewhere, the application has to be followed ... has to be preceded by a certain amount of ordinary physical activity and stimulation—not much of it—and as far as work is concerned it is a simple thing: Observe, try to become Impartial, and see if you can do it Simultaneously. And that's all.

Read Gurdjieff. It's a terrible book. The sentences are much too long and the words that he uses are quite unusual and sometimes much too long to pronounce; and every once in a while you think that he is pulling your leg and that he doesn't know what he is talking about and he appears like a fool. At the same time it's quite intriguing, but you have to continue with it a little bit in order to find it out. And then he makes statements that are so completely absurd from our standpoint of what we know of science and how it is this-and-that—and what is time—and then

it becomes a --[inaudible]-- because it is so obvious; and at the same time if you really persist in reading it from beginning to end, you get an impression of something that really means something and has definitely a metaphorical or an allegorical meaning to it; and you don't grasp it, but it's interesting.

Maybe you'll read it.

What other questions are there. Because now we talked a little bit in general. Is it clear what Work is—what Work is, what is meant by it?

New Questioner: Is there anything in addition to physical self-Observation that I can do to increase a sense of Awakening.

Mr. Nyland: No. You see, it is already difficult—and we talked about it—to become Objective. It is something new. I call it a new 'faculty.' It is located in a part of the brain which is still capable of developing that kind of a faculty, because it is at the present time virgin field. It is really not used. There are certain sections in the brain that really don't belong to the brain; or rather, they belong to a mental capacity of the brain but they are not active at all. And why they are there, it is quite interesting. The assumption that I make is simply that they are there for a definite purpose of further development for Man, and that if he could actually develop those parts—there are five lobes above the temple, it is a well-known fact as far as brain knowledge is concerned that they are not functioning any way whatsoever—that because of that particular mental equipment that is there, it only has to be trained to become Objective.

By 'Objective' I mean, now, that they become like a sense organ but functioning simply as an intellectual organ only, without interference with either the physical center or from one's emotional center. Now, that is already difficult to start with. Because there is nothing than only the 'ground,' you might say, on which this particular little faculty could be directed. The materials in order to start building it and the intention that I must have, has to come from something in me which is very seldom coming to the foreground or even to the surface, and which has been covered up within myself. So that in the first place I have to get used to the idea that that what is within me is very small, and then what I have to build doesn't exist and I have to supply the building materials for it.

It is another way of saying that that what is in Man, and you might say can be compared to his wish to continue to live; or at least his wish to understand his life as it is, or perhaps that he for himself will try to find out, if he possibly can, what is the aim of his own existence in this life

that he knows on Earth. Aside from all kind of other philosophical possibilities of life Hereafter and will death actually mean the end of my existence and things of that kind, I'm not talking about. I'm talking only, now, about Man as he is on Earth and he is in an unconscious state; and in order to become self-Conscious certain Work has to be done, and that means he has to have a faculty that starts to function Objectively; since he now has the place where it could be built, he has now to furnish material to build it.

He does that by trying to become clear of what is involved. Now, there are three different ways a person is fed. One of course is ordinary food—liquid and solids, whatever it may be. The second form of food is air for breathing, and the third is impressions. Under impressions we understand sense organs functioning in a human being as hearing or seeing or touch or smell or taste. Through means of these so-called sense 'organs' I receive from the outside certain forms of energies which are directed by means of nerves and so forth to a part of my brain and then furnishes it with a certain energy which can be used for the further maintenance of myself as a personality. It's the same with ordinary foods—the solids and liquids—it's the same with breathing; and this is the way my body is functioning, and if any one of them stops then I die. That is, if I don't eat food I have hunger, and if for a long time ... and I can go on a strike, ultimately my body will be emaciated because it is not sufficiently fed. Breathing is much worse, because I cannot stop breathing for any length of time without actually dying; knowing that, I will not hold my breath that long because there is a certain wish for self-preservation. As far as impressions are concerned, I think it's very difficult to decide if I really need impressions or not; and if I try to imagine that I was without any sense impressions, what would be my life worth: My brain wouldn't function, I doubt very much that my feeling would function; and perhaps all that would be left would be, as it were, a 'piece of body' that had to exist, and *still* it is necessary for that existence that the blood circulates and that there is a nerve system and that there is some way of feeding the different cells otherwise they would atrophy. Now, for that I need a brain in order to direct it—at least to put some ordinary common sense in my body—and I would probably have to have a feeling in order to produce certain forms of energy which for me help to keep the temperature of myself at a certain level. Don't let's go too far into the detail about the physiology of Man, but there is no question that he does need these impressions the way they are as a form of energy for the maintenance of himself as a personality.

Now, the question is: Where will I get the energy necessary for building this Objective

faculty. I start with that which seems the easiest; that is, I want to use impression of myself as I receive them through sense organs, but I want to have them digested only up to the point of following ... let's say of 'giving' an intellectual brain the benefit of all the energies without the interference of anything else. Or to say it in another way: Whenever such energies are received in the brain, I don't want part of it to go into a feeling center, or even into an activity. Assuming now for a moment that that is a way of receiving energy—and there are more ways than that one ... but in any event there is a possibility then that I have material which, in me if I want to build something of a different kind of this time of that what is called 'Objectivity' is of a different kind of quality, it would require the conversion of such energy into an energy of a different rate of vibration in order to be suitable material for that.

But again, let's forget that. I have now in my possibility something that I could use for the purpose of the continuation of that kind of Work which I now call trying to be 'Awake,' it simply means that the impressions are received, I would like to receive them Consciously. For that I try, now, to make this part of the brain which is virgin field, start to function in perceiving that what I am physically. You see, the reason why I want to start with that, is that when I try to Observe the totality of my personality it is the body, and the feeling center, and my intellect. Either one—or all three altogether—of course could be an object for Observation. But the Observation has to include non-identification or Impartiality, and it has to be done at the moment. The difficulty in it is that I start also to include Observation of my feeling center, it's extremely difficult with that to become Impartial; because I want to exclude my feelings, so when I Observe my feelings I will have a difficult time. When I wish to Observe my intellectual capacity and I want to do it at the moment of receiving that kind of impression, then I am interfered with all the mental facilities and faculties that are at the present time in my brain which are not interested in that moment. So in order to create as good a condition and let's say I try to make it as 'successful' as I can, I take the simplest way of learning how to Observe; and for that I can use my body—*provided* I have my body do certain activities in which I am not emotionally or intellectually involved.

You see, this is reducing it to its simplest form. Now I become in that sense then Aware of the existence of certain functions ... manifestations of my body and *only that*; constantly having in mind that if I once have practiced enough and I have acquired the facility of what is meant and I know how to Work, *then* I can change the object and instead of Observing the physical body

only, I can then start to learn to Observe what goes on in the feeling center and ultimately what goes on in the brain.

But, you see, for the time being I am completely green as far as the ability to Observe, even; and when I reduce the manifestations of the body to a minimum in which I don't have to feel or to think or to describe or to write it, I take such ordinary manifestations like just simply walking. When I walk there is no reason whatsoever why I have to like it—I walk, I am—or that I am very tall. I just happen to walk; and it is an activity which gives me, each moment, the possibility of receiving an impression of myself, this body walking which then can be registered at the moment, without any interference, in this new section of the brain which I like to develop.

That is why I start with the physical center. After I know enough I can go a little bit further; at the same time when I see the physical center as behavior forms and the manifestations—and I have enumerated them several times: I am interested in a simple movement, I am interested in gestures of the body, I am interested in postures, I'm interested in facial expression, muscular tension, tone of the voice, sometimes breathing—if I could become Objective regarding such manifestations I also know that the manifestations in ordinary life are the result of some kind of a thought or a feeling which becomes the impetus for my activity physically. And that therefore if I could become Objective to that what is a manifestation I gradually could become Objective to that what has been the source of the manifestation, and in that way I would reach my feeling center or my intellectual center.

So, you see, I'm not worried about forgetting part of my personality. Ultimately it will have to be an Objectivity regarding all of me; but it is a difficult thing already to start with, so I have to start with that what is the simplest.

Does that answer it?

New Questioner: Yes.

Questioner: I'd like to ask ... I'd like to inquire about, uh, the sensory deprivation which you were earlier discussing; when your physical center is not in use, for what it is in anything else. For example, when one might be sleeping and perhaps even dreaming, what form of activity would you describe this to be.

Mr. Nyland: Well, I think that sleep ... you mean physical sleep?

Questioner: Well, physical sleep and then also the act of dreaming.

Mr. Nyland: Well, the act of dreaming of course is a little haphazard, isn't it. Because you

cannot dictate to yourself what you want to dream. Usually you know what you have dreamt if it is clear, sometimes it is not clear at all. But, I think it is accidental. I think what takes place when one sleeps physically, is that there is gradually a relaxation of the different centers. If the center is enough of an image in order to build up a personality out of the three centers like a physical center or a feeling center—I call it 'feeling' because it is not as yet deep enough to be called an emotion—and an intellectual center which is simply our mental functioning, then I think that in physical sleep there is gradually a relaxation of a certain kind which makes the bond which now exists during daily life and connecting the different centers, relaxes them and gradually separates the centers from each other, and that in a good sleep that each center then starts to recuperate on its own.

I know how that is in the morning when I wake up out of a refreshing sleep—that then it is as if I am a new person in which the three centers almost can start to function independently of each other. But since I am so used to having it function differently, immediately when I open my eyes and my thoughts start, I already start to connect them; and very soon after I have actually wakened up and I am ... let's say I am eating breakfast, I'm back again in the old functioning of my personality.

Now, I think that a dream comes when an intellectual center is relaxed and is not interfered with by either the body or the feeling center; and that then whatever material there is in the form of memory which perhaps are facts stored away or pigeonholed in some way or other, on account of the relaxed state it is as if the little doors are open and they can go out and wander around a little bit and then come to a certain form of my consciousness. How that actually functions is very difficult to know; and you know in yourself that it is dependent many times on accidental happenings, and that sometimes if my sleep is deep enough this does not happen. Because there is ... it is apparently necessary that my sleep is on the surface before the thoughts come out, but when it is deep they don't come out and stay where they are. When it is deep, apparently there is a much better configuration for a mental state; and it is not loosely connected but it stays at the configuration and then everything stays in its place, and the intensity of a sleep when it is depth will relax a person ultimately, and will rest him much more than a superficial one.

Well, there's a great deal that can be said still about dreams—or about ordinary sleep the way it is, and how long and how we are affected and what associations there are—but in a dream or in a sleep there is nothing that can direct anything that is taking place, and I'm completely

dependent on that what happens accidentally. Now, to what extent this is affected by conditions outside of me; maybe sometimes certain smells or certain noises or certain influences of others, or perhaps atmospheres which I don't know about or certain conditions where there are laws which I do not know, it is very difficult to know that when I had a dream that that dream was the cause ... or was caused by something that I can trace. And even if I say "Yes, I think it is that" and I try to create the same kind of a condition in order to have the same kind of a dream, it usually is not successful.

I do not know how much you know about dream life in general, but you see it is a little bit too unconscious for one to work with. Now, I think we have a much better chance if one is in an ordinary unconscious state but so-called 'awake,' and from the standpoint of Gurdjieff we call it a 'waking-dreaming' state or a 'waking-sleeping' state. Well, the same kind of thing happens to me when I become automatic, and of course I know what it is to daydream: It is, then, in a state in which I am relaxed, usually relaxed intellectually in which my thoughts that are there go from one side to the other also without rhyme or reason. And perhaps I stare a little bit and I am not entirely there; but nevertheless I am in a certain dreamy, almost happy kind of a state in which almost anything can happen until, for some reason or another I happen to wake up a little bit more and then I realize that I have been dreaming ... a state I'm in.

Now, I think this is a much better field; because there is something that is a little bit more conscious as compared to the state of physical sleep, and that therefore if I want really to find out what it is that takes place in my daily life when I daydream or when I am half-awake, half-asleep, if I know what it is to be *really* Awake and *not* asleep I would need a certain form of Consciousness which, at the time when I am in a waking-sleeping state also could be present.

You see, the difficulty is always that I may experience a great many things, but then all of me experiences it and there is nothing that can remain Objective regarding it. You see, either an experience takes me up ... or it takes up part of me—that what has to be engaged in that kind of an experience—but there is nothing that is independent of it and has an ability you might say to 'watch' it, to see what is actually happening. It would be of extreme value if anyone who is an Observer outside of me, could tell me what my behavior is, and could tell it Impartially. You see, the same way we carry on an experiment in a research test, anyone who experiments is of course an observer of the experiment; and I am not identified with it when the experiment takes place, but nevertheless I, as the observer or the research Man, has to give a report of what

actually has been ... has happened.

Now, if—and this is now an assumption—if there would be a possibility in a self-Conscious state that an 'I' functioning independently of the personality could function in such a way that it could Observe truthfully and record facts which are more absolute, more real, then I would have a chance to judge about my waking-sleeping state and I would be able to describe, from the standpoint of Objectivity, that what is a subjective state. Because I have the possibility of building that, whereas in physical sleep I have no chance. You see, for that reason it is already interesting from a scientific standpoint: If it is actually true that there is a certain section of the brain that could develop and I want to try it and prove it to myself, then I would have, with this, a certain means of actually studying myself in an Impartial manner; and that all these states that I undergo as a personality either in my sleep—real physical sleep—or in my waking-sleeping unconscious state, then if I could be outside of ... or something of me could be outside of me as an 'I' could function, then that 'I' could be the receiver of information which I cannot get as long as I remain subjective.

You see what I mean. We have a chance in daydreaming which we don't have with ordinary physical sleep, really And that is one of the reasons, I think, that it becomes quite important to consider one's life on Earth as a means or a steppingstone towards something by which then I can see what my life is worth; and if this 'I'—and again I say 'if,' and it is not entirely an assumption but at least it is an assumption to the extent that 'I' needs time to develop—but if it could be there in principle and have the possibility of further growth, that then such an 'I' could look at me as a personality benevolently, but nevertheless from the standpoint of considering me Objectively as an object, record certain states that I cannot record as long as I am with myself within me.

The question of Impartiality, the question of being Objective I think is an excellent idea compared to all the different other possible developments of a subjective kind. And there is no question that as far as the development of any one of the three centers is concerned, that one can reach a certain height; and that I think ultimately with enough life experience that one can start to sift out and throw away that what is not worth anymore, and that after that one retains essential values only. There is no doubt, I think a fakir, or a monk ... a saint, or a yogi—to take only these three as examples, you might say, of a possible development of any one of the three centers—do reach, without any question, certain states of consciousness which they then will compare to the

reaching of a higher level and perhaps a unity, or in any event a communication of that what is for them a higher form of living, or a higher spirit, or whatever they want to define it as.

But, you see, even if that is possible and even if in the long run in ordinary life a person could acquire certain things of an Objective value because he experiences for a long time and it wears off and he retains that what becomes more and more essential or becomes more and more simple, also it is without any question the truth that if a Man lives long enough he could become Conscious. But, you see, he doesn't live long enough, and our lifespan of sixty, seventy, or eighty years is not enough. There is no question that even in the present time in our age, now, when everything tends towards making it much easier for one's life, that I become much too lazy and I don't want to do anything because I expect a push button to do it; whereas in the olden days and in the times of Methuselah perhaps nine hundred years was a long enough time for him to become sufficiently mature and perhaps in that sense Conscious.

But you might say that to some extent it's philosophy; at the same time if it is a possibility of existing and only dependent on the time of one's life or a time duration, then logically speaking there ought to be certain means which catalyzes that kind of a reaction. You see, whenever anything can take place ... let's say chemically speaking a certain reaction will take place within a certain length of time; and many times by the introduction of something that is entirely foreign to the substances that are reacting, I can shorten the process and I call it a 'catalyzer' or a 'catalytic influence.' Now, if it takes place in ordinary life and usually this ... either chemically of physically or psychologically I am subject to similar kinds of laws; that that what is taking place as far as development is concerned or an evolution for myself, if I can find a substance of a different kind of nature which would catalyze that kind of a reaction and the velocity then is shortened, I can within my lifetime reach a certain point for which otherwise I would need two or three hundred years. And this I say is the advantage ... or rather, the intriguing value of an investigation along the lines of Objectivity: Because in Objectivity I unquestionably have something that is entirely different from any subjective form. You see, that is by definition. It is not subjective. Anything that is Objective has to be a non-subjective something.

So the introduction of that kind of a thing which is strange for me, unnatural for me; and again, now, comparing it with that what I know out of history or whatever there is out of folklore or out of the stories of the holy grail or the golden fleece, or that what is unknown and everyone

hunts for and whatever it may be—the pearl of great price of that which is mythologically many times brought to the foreground of something that ought to exist—and which people ... the knights who hunt for and who will sacrifice this-and-that for her, or the searchers or those who really believe in the existence of the impossible try to find that what ought to made possible for them; and whatever their belief may entail or whatever may be the basis of a certain religion that they believe that sometime there will be grace for them so that then at such a time they could become Conscious through the grace of the Lord, it doesn't matter at all, the principle remains the same: That in myself if I can believe that the possibility of an Objective state exists and that for me it could be experienced, then it becomes worthwhile for me to try to find the way to it.

So, you see, in that sense there is a certain advantage to the different experiences a person can have; because he knows that in his life there have been at certain times moments which he will not forget. When I say I will 'not forget,' that means they have been registered outside of my ordinary memory. Because my memory always will forget; but when I say "I will not forget it" it has been registered, mentally it was there as an experience but it was not subject to a thought. Now, this is interesting. Because that is exactly what I would like. I would like to have something recorded independent of a thinking process; because a thinking process has to do with that what is past or what is the future, but that what is actually indelibly engraved in me could be a moment; because it is then of a certain freedom, a freedom from a time dimension as a moment comparable to a point which is non-dimensional in space.

So, you see, I'm now in the right direction. Because if I know that there are moments in my life which I do remember—and I remember very vividly as if it happened yesterday—that that kind of an experience is registered in me, it means that there is something in me that could start to function if only it could be fed, and then all that I have to do is find out how I can feed it because I have settled the question that it is possible for it; so if I say if that is an 'absolute' of Objectivity or a 'proof' for me that Objectivity in the first place exists ... and that I think is already quite logical because I can naturally assume that that what exists on Earth must have something that will lead ultimately to the non-existence of Earth, and that I can call 'Objectivity.'

Cosmologically, of course what is Earth is different from planetary level is different from solar level. If I say physiologically that what is the periphery of my life, my skin is different from my essence and it is different from that what I would call 'essential essence.' There is

always, like in the temple, a certain part where everybody tells "Thank God" this-and-that. There is one part in which not everybody is allowed, and there is also something that is my private domain which is, for me and in the terminology of Gurdjieff, Magnetic Center. So when I talk about a world and I look at it from the cosmological standpoint of the solar system, there are quite definitely three different gradations. When I look at my own world in which my body becomes Earth then my feelings are planets and my head is the Sun; if that is the real reason of my totality of existence as world, then if I believe that it is possible to live on Earth first, I will have to find out in myself in an Objective sense how to live in my feelings, and afterwards how to live in my Consciousness. And all search for self-Consciousness or perhaps Cosmic Consciousness is predicated on that idea that it is possible for me to change the point of gravity from my body to an emotional center and to a Consciousness; and I simply designate that as states in which I am 'waking-sleeping' when I am physically engaged on Earth, a 'Waking' state—in the real sense of the word 'Awake' when I am self-Conscious—and that what I call 'Cosmic Conscious' is of course something that is a little bit beyond me because I really have not much experience of Cosmic Consciousness. But I will know, when I could become self-Conscious, that then Cosmic Consciousness would be the next door so there is, again, that possibility of a stepwise change. And, it has to be stepwise; because it means that the catalyzer is of a different kind of nature than that what is the ordinary reactions that take place either physically or psychologically; so when I now start to Work I introduce an Objectivity as a faculty which is not as yet developed, but which is in principle absolutely different from anything that is natural.

Well again, you see, if you look now at Man as potentiality which could develop if he only knows how to develop, then one must come to the conclusion that Man the way he is, is not developed sufficiently; and that although for the purpose of Work it's quite all right to live on Earth and we can do whatever we are doing quite well, from the standpoint of evolution he still has to know how to develop further. Now, again to come back to the terminology of Gurdjieff: It simply means that a Man has the potentiality—and actuality if he knew—how to develop within himself three bodies, again the states would indicate physical appearance, emotionally it would be planetary, Consciously it would be solar. Also it would mean self-Consciousness and Cosmic Consciousness.

Again, it is the changing of the world into something of a larger world; in which, of course,

the same kind of proportions prevail, but where ultimately that what is changing from one world to another hoping that, by means of that Man progresses towards the possibility of ultimate freedom. Philosophically it means that he, in that search for freedom, would realize the possibility of an existence without any bonds whatsoever. And if that is what Man wishes, realizing that he is at the present time bound the way he is because of conditions on Earth whatever they may be—it happens to be there and that Man cannot fly—that the only way by which he can actually leave this Earth is developing a certain form of a 'body,' if you want to call it that way, of a certain density which will, I would almost say 'automatically' leave Earth because it is light enough not to be bound by the law of attraction, the law of gravity.

So you see, this question again of changing from the density of material form in which we are to an emotional kind, is already one step towards a lighter kind of a density. And in a lighter kind of a density it is including then, of course more freedom and the higher it would go towards—to give it simply a picture—towards an absoluteness, or towards an endlessness, or towards that what is a simplicity of form in the center of the universe.

Again, these are simply concepts that one can think about and dream about a little bit, they have very little to say unless I can get on my road and I hope that ultimately I will reach it. I think this is one of the tremendous advantages of Gurdjieff: That he gives that kind of a hope, and it is not just a question of Ten Commandments and do what is prescribed there without knowing what to do. Because I cannot possibly as a human being, even with the best of intentions I cannot follow the Ten Commandments. I wouldn't know how to do it. I cannot separate myself at the present time, the way I am—for example with adultery, or I cannot steal and I cannot lie, or...—of course I do. I am a human being on Earth and I am forced to do these things in an unconscious state; and perhaps I am not entirely responsible, but nevertheless my behavior is like that.

Well, we are getting a little bit astray from the original dream state, you see. But all of this is like a perspective belonging to a perfectly good reason why an idea like Objectivity has a *raison d'etre*: It is actually a possibility as something that is possible and worthwhile to become interested in, much more worthwhile than many things that leave you a little bit cold or leave you up a creek. Because, they don't know what to do. Some say love is God, what does that mean: Absolutely nothing. Simply because I don't know what love is—yes—so why compare God, it's stupidity.

Your hand's up.

New Questioner: I don't know how to ask this question. If a child lives in a house of turmoil, perhaps the only thing other than that that he knows is the cessation of it; it's not replaced with anything else; it stops, only when he's brought into a place of harmony can he have experiences like that. I have experienced a liberation from my ordinary state with no place to go.

Mr. Nyland: Well, you say ... you say you only know it when there is a cessation of a state ... there is a cessation of it, perhaps it is not true. Because I think that in each person there is a form of life that at times comes to the foreground; and when they realize that it is something that he calls his life, we know it when it is threatened. That is, there is something in me that wants to protect that what I consider my life; when there is danger or when someone is going to hit me, I will automatically, as a reflex hold up my arm in order to ward it off. I don't want ... when I am still alive and I am full of that—full of my wish to want to continue—I will always protect that what I have. So the question is: Where does that come from. Because it is not something that I know as a cessation of my life; because I have not been in that state as yet, at the same time I cherish or I have a wish regarding the maintenance or the keeping of that life force.

So I think that a person can have an idea of something, not necessarily as an experience but as an extrapolation; that what he distills out of the experience he knows, then to come to a conclusion that something else *also* exists—or exists notwithstanding. Where does the wish to want to continue to live come from. Originally when Man is born or when he is conceived, he is simply put on Earth in a certain form, and where did that form of life come from. You can say father and mother but that is, of course, begging the question; because where did that come from in them, and is it possible to look at the totality of all life existing not only in Man but in animals or in plants, of a certain kind that is now manifested on Earth with the assumption that such life force ... *if* it is a force, or if it is a condition which depends on a certain configuration representing life.

You see, we don't solve that problem immediately—of saying this is life, or we can reproduce it. It is simply ... it's still a fact of having to accept it as it exists, and an explanation of why it exists on Earth is quite a different one. But nevertheless each person who keeps on breathing knows that he exists. Each person who has within him aspiration, is looking for the possibility of an expression. Anyone who has inspiration, is looking inside for the possibility of expressing that what is perhaps not sufficiently developed. Anyone who has an artistic desire of

creation always will look for something that is not as yet created, or made, in order to make something new which then you might say would 'satisfy' him, and if he's a good artist it never would satisfy him.

So, you see, I think one can have feelings and sometimes a little notion of something existing which is of a higher kind of a quality than Earth provides. That I mean by Magnetic Center. That is, I think something that was put in Man when he was conceived and when he was born ... when he appeared on Earth which was a quality coming from a different level of Being than Earth. It may be, if one considers that as a certain theory that is more or less logical, involutionarily coming from the Sun Absolute. Again these are terms, they don't have much meaning, they only have meaning within oneself if one can conceive of oneself as being made up of different forms of density within one. And that what I call for myself more 'ethereal'—or perhaps more magnetic or perhaps purer or more essential, or sometimes I say 'heavenly' or sometimes 'not of this Earth'—is something that I know I experience ... and I have and sometimes I want to express it, but this could become for one a certain guiding post if it always could be there.

Now, the difficulty is that when it comes and is expressed, there is so little of it that it is taken up by the manifestation which I then experience, and for that reason I am at a loss; all I do is I experience a certain something that is different and it is very interesting to me and perhaps agreeable and perhaps I wish it to happen again, but I don't know how it happened before because it was accidental. So if that is the case and one is living under these kind of accidental laws, one starts to wonder if it is possible to find out what is this law that must exist, but for me is an accidental something that happens to me and I do not know how to produce it.

Again, you see, the only solution is that one has an outside viewpoint of that what is taking place; so that from that standpoint you have a panorama looking down on that what is now accidental, which, from the other standpoint away from it ... higher from it, higher than that, will become a law for me. If I have certain things happening to me which I do not understand and which are accidental for me, the only way for me to find out what is taking in me is to see if I can reach a standpoint of an Objectivity away from myself so that then what is happening can be explained to me. At the same time, if it is possible to live away from myself on a certain level I call it again 'Objective': That there is something that can remain untouched even if that what I am on a lower level is experiencing a certain condition. Logically, it is absolutely correct.

Because it is possible that at certain times that what I would call an 'I', or the beginning of an 'I', does not take part in the experiences of 'It'. That is, if I could live with part of me on the planet Mars or any other planet; if I could live in my emotional center; if I could develop an emotional body I could change my point of gravity to live there, then my physical body and all its manifestations I could become Objective to, and whatever then happens to *that*, I could guide it from the Objective standpoint.

You see, it's the only way. Otherwise you are all the time subject to any kind of subjectivity, and you will be blown by the wind without any rudder. An 'I' is the only solution for anything that ... that I am looking for a guide, I am looking for that what could remain permanent within me that is to some extent untouchable, to a great extent absolutely not changeable, and also it has to be permanent. By 'permanency' I mean that it is available at any one time I make it; and that I can stand on it and that then it will not change, but it will give me sufficient foothold to start from and to try, from that standpoint, to become operative or to become active. And it is, of course, inherent in any form of artistic creation, that one wants to create something in this world in a certain form from the standpoint of that which is essentially essence within one. I mean that, naturally, is the highest form; and if then that can be instilled—or rather, it can be made alive—by one's life's blood, then that what is art becomes actually a permanent, practical example of remaining in existence. It is simply a description of what really Objective art should be, and of course it has to be entirely different from any kind of subjective self-expression. But, it is not only art. Philosophy is exactly the same and so is science, and so is any direct form in which we in ordinary life are interested.

So religion, of course, is a little different. That is religion, if it is correctly understood I have to assume that there is a certain deity, or a higher form of Being existing, who for some reason or another happens to know about me; and the only way by which I can explain it is that that what I would call 'my God' is myself within me in the best state I could imagine for myself, or stay with as much freedom as I would be able to try to actualize and that for the time being I call God, even if I have to shift it and gradually become clearer and clearer about the concept of God. But whichever way that may be and one may be religiously brought up in any kind of a religion that requires a definite God of a certain kind—Jewish or Christianity or Roman Catholic, or even oriental philosophies and religions ... Hindu; whatever it may be, something outside of me exists, the assumption must be that the universe is intelligently built and there are certain

laws I don't know. And the admission that I don't know but hoping that someday I will understand it, certainly can be a motivating force for me to become interested in anything that will uncover that kind of a secret.

After all, the purposes of life are not so manyfold; it is really to become a good Man, and in the sense of Gurdjieff it would be a Harmonious Man. That is, that Man could develop whatever is at the present time potential for him in order to free himself from Earth and the bondage of earth; so that even while he is alive on Earth he might use the opportunities which are given at the present time to try to build something that could become much more permanent for him, and ultimately will enable him to understand the reason why he is alive. That I think in a nutshell is the ideas of Gurdjieff, and if you want to find out you have to learn how to do it. And this is the 'doing,' now, that she mentioned in the beginning—Work on yourself—and again I say 'Observation, Impartiality, and Simultaneity.'

But, you see, you don't understand much of this, because you are not sufficiently interested in it; and unless you start to read or think or meditate about it and consider your life for whatever it is worth and then you dare to come to certain conclusions that you are really automatic, quite mechanical—at least, I say, ninety percent to start with—and that there are many many things that are just habitual, absolutely without even your ordinary consciousness—the ordinary!—let alone a certain form of self-Consciousness; that there are many deeds, many activities that are so completely superficial that nothing enters into it, not even any kind of a conscience. And that the conscience that you do have of course is determined by the conditions in which you have lived and the kind of morality you have been brought up; and that the question of education is simply has been a filling yourself with an awful lot of nonsensical data which you never will use, and that at the present time as far as the expenditure of your energies is concerned, it's absolutely absurd how wasteful you are.

But you see, you have to come to grips with that kind of a question. Is it really so. What is an Impartial Criticism of myself; and am I willing to accept it for whatever that is, and if I do accept it does it bother me sufficiently so that I actually will lose sleep—that is, that I have to do something about it because it is a necessity like an obligation. But you see, what parts of sleep we usually are; we listen a little bit to something about Gurdjieff and we read a little bit and maybe for a few moments or maybe for a couple of months you remain a little interested, and then it gets a little difficult and then you say "To hell with it, I'm not interested anymore." This

is such stupidity. Anything that you want to do will cost you something, time and energy. Otherwise, how else will you ever be able to overbridge that what you are now unconsciously and with the possibility of becoming Conscious. You have to Work for it. You have to work for your living; if you don't work for it you die, simply you die and it doesn't matter—if you believe that and it doesn't matter anyhow, so "What the hell."

But, you see, you have to be serious about these kinds of questions. I think that it is necessary for a Man, for anyone who wants to be called a Man really to consider life seriously and not to be a fool. And then, if he doesn't want to be a fool he knows that time is short; so that he doesn't want to spend his energy in directions which turn out to be detours, he wants to go straight and he wants to be efficient ... and he wants to become responsible for that what is, now, let's say not too much talk and not too many unnecessary movements, and not too many so-called 'feelings' that don't concern him, and not too much sawdust in my head.

But you see, I don't know if I talk that kind of a language that you are a little familiar with. Maybe you are not. Maybe you don't know anything about what I am saying, and maybe sometimes there is a little bit. I do not know. You have to find out for yourself, so it is your problem and not mine. If you wish, there is opportunity to do something quite real and then to pursue something that really could give you some results. And, don't waste too much of your time. The energies that you have at the present time, they will not always be there. You will not always be young ... and you will not stay young unless you know how to stay young; and before you know *that* a lot of water will have to flow over the dam, and perhaps you will have to suffer a little bit more in order to find out what is the value for yourself of even your ordinary life. How to solve the problems that you face; what it is in any kind of a relationship, any kind of a behavior form of yourself in that way in which you cannot be honest even if you wanted to be, and that many many times you don't know which way to turn because there are no signposts as yet.

You see, you find yourself in such states, and *then* what. What is there. You don't know. After a little while it disappears; so you hope it won't come back, it probably will come back, what will you do: Take some nice tranquilizers?, or a few drugs?, or try to get a shortcut that way to some nonsense? You read about all the junk that is being published. Everything that goes on, of course you form an opinion; a little bit superficial, you follow what someone else says because you have belief in them, do you know yourself what you are talking about? You are

exposed to all kinds of influences, what are you going to do. Take it? Oppose it? Go along with it? Understand it? Change it? What will you do. You are growing older, what will happen. You lose interest, where is your aspiration of youth, where is your inner life.

Excuse me that I say these things. They belong to life, they belong to everyone, if you want to make it worthwhile you have to consider it. If you wish to remain superficial with just a little bit of an indentation once in a while, it's entirely up to you. Because, no one will call you to account. There is no dire necessity of going through hell after you die. Purgatory—perhaps; but that is on Earth, and the amount of suffering you may have to go through at the present time, how do you know and how will you avoid it, and maybe you're lucky and maybe you're not. What is there that's in oneself that can remain permanent for oneself, on which you can stand and then from there you can go ... and then you know how to go because there is some kind of insight, and inspiration maybe.

So I would suggest if you want to and if you are interested, read more. I hope to be back in October. I hope to stay a little longer so that perhaps we can have some more meetings. We can also have discussions—talk about it—but you have to have the material. And anyone; if you are really interested, if you feel that there is a possibility of finding some solution for certain problems ... because if you don't have problems Gurdjieff doesn't even exist for you, but if you do have some of it—that is, something that is a little uneasy and that perhaps is not so easily solved—maybe in this direction there is a solution. Then maybe we can talk about it, in the meantime if you are really interested keep in touch or in contact with those people who know a little bit more, in any event, than you do. And if that's the case, I wish you all good luck.

Goodnight.

End of tape